REMARKS

1. Claims 1-16 are pending. Of these claims, claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14 and 16 stand rejected and claims 3, 12, 13 and 15 stand objected to.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

- 2. Objected to claims 3, 12, 13 and 15 contain allowable subject matter.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 6,791,260 to Komatsu.

This rejection is respectfully traversed as Komatsu does not expressly or inherently describe the subject matter of claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 11. Claims 1 and 5 each recite:

...first and second organic light-emitting layers disposed between the first and second anodes; and

a first electrode disposed between the first and second organic light-emitting layers.

Komatsu does not expressly or inherently disclose the above features. In contrast, Komatsu merely discloses a single, stepped organic thin film 103 (FIG. 10) that is disposed <u>over</u> anodes 107 and 118, and a first electrode 108 disposed <u>under</u> the single, stepped organic thin film 103. Komatsu, therefore, fails to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 are clearly allowable over Komatsu.

With regard to claims 2, 4 and 11, which respectively depend from claims 1 and 5 and recite additional features of the invention, applicant believes that these claims are allowable over Komatsu for at least the same reasons as stated for claims 1 and 5.

Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komatsu over U.S. Patent No 6,043,478 to Wang.

Claims 6-10 depend from claim 5 and therefore recite:

...first and second organic light-emitting layers disposed between the first and second anodes; and

a first electrode disposed between the first and second organic light-emitting layers.

As discussed earlier, Komatsu fails to disclose, teach or suggest these features because Komatsu merely discloses a single, stepped organic thin film 103 (FIG. 10) that is disposed <u>over</u> anodes 107 and 118, and a first electrode 108 disposed <u>under</u> the single, stepped organic thin film 103.

It is respectfully submitted that Wang does not cure the deficiencies of Komatsu because Wang is merely directed to an active pixel sensor with a shared readout structure and not a display with an organic light emitting diode structure, as claimed. Accordingly, neither Wang nor Komatsu in view of Wang teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 6-10. For at least this reason, claims 6-10 are allowable over Komatsu in view of Wang.

Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,822,611 B1 to Kontogeorgakis et al. (Kontogeorgakis) in view of Komatsu. In support of this rejection, the examiner particularly relies on Komatsu for teaching the claimed organic light-emitting structure not described in Kontogeorgakis.

It is respectfully submitted that Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu do not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 14, which recites:

...first and second organic light-emitting layers disposed between the first and second anodes; and

a first electrode disposed between the first and second organic light-emitting layers.

Instead, Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu merely disclose a single, stepped organic thin film 103 (FIG. 10) that is disposed <u>over</u> anodes 107 and 118, and a first electrode 108 disposed <u>under</u> the single, stepped organic thin film 103. Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu, therefore, fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 14.

Accordingly, claim 14 is clearly allowable over Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu.

With regard to claim 16, which depends from claim 14 and recites additional features of the invention, applicant believes that this claim is allowable over Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu for at least the same reasons as stated for claim 14.

Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu and Wang.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 14 and therefore recite:

...first and second organic light-emitting layers disposed between the first and second anodes; and

a first electrode disposed between the first and second organic light-emitting layers.

As discussed earlier, Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu fail to teach or suggest these features because Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu merely teach a single, stepped organic thin film 103 (FIG. 10) that is disposed <u>over</u> anodes 107 and 118, and a first electrode 108 disposed <u>under</u> the single, stepped organic thin film 103.

It is respectfully submitted that Wang does not cure the deficiencies of Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu because Wang is merely directed to an active pixel sensor with a shared readout structure and not a display with an organic light emitting diode structure, as claimed. Accordingly, neither Wang nor Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu in view of Wang teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 17 and 18. For at least this reason, claims 17 and 18 are allowable over Kontogeorgakis in view of Komatsu and Wang.

Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested as it is believed that all outstanding issues have been addressed herein and, further, that claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions or matters whose resolution may be advanced by a telephone call, the examiner is cordially invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

8. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17, which are associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2061.

Respectfully sulmitted,

Paul A. Schwarz Reg. No. 37,577

Duane Morris LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203
609-631-2446- Tel
609-631-2401 - Fax
DM2\653780.1